

Remarks

Applicants note that an amendment after final was filed January 18, 2005 and was not entered remains not entered.

Claims 7 and 13 are amended.

Claims 14-17 are cancelled.

Claims 22 and 23 are new.

The application now contains claims 7, 13, 22 and 23.

Claims 7 and 13 are amended to more appropriately describe the instant invention as an "Electroluminescent diketopyrrolopyrrole". The term "Fluorescent" is deleted from claim 1; the term compound is deleted from claim 13 to render the language of claim 7 and 13 consistent. Support is found in paragraph 6 on page 35 of the specification.

Claims 14-17 are cancelled.

Claims 22 and 23 are added claim novel electroluminescent diketopyrrolopyrroles that are found within the specification but are not within the definition of claim 7 and replace, in part, deleted claims 14-17. The compounds of claim 22 and 23 were contained in original claims 14-17 which were withdrawn due to Examiner's restriction. As the compounds of claims 7, 13, 22 and 23 are all found within the specification and all share the common property of being electroluminescent diketopyrrolopyrroles, Applicant respectfully ask that these claims be joined and considered together.

No new matter is added.

Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Jost et.al., U. S. Pat. 4,585,878. Jost generically claims certain compounds of the present invention and teaches that they are fluorescent, column 9, line 30.

Previously presented data by Applicants demonstrating the surprisingly superior electroluminescence of the instant naphthyl and phenanthryl substituted DPP compounds vs the compounds exemplified in Jost were also deemed insufficient by the Examiner to demonstrate superior/unexpected results commensurate with the scope of the instant claims.

Applicants suggest that the previously presented data and arguments should be reconsidered seen in light of the above amendments making specific reference to the electroluminescence of the instant compounds.

Applicants submit that using electroluminescence data to demonstrate surprising/superior results should not be held as inappropriate simply because Jost could not anticipate such a use. Jost presents no data regarding the compounds of the present invention and fails to point toward their selection such a use.

In light of the above amendments, the present discussion and the data presented previously, Applicants submit that the 35 USC 103(a) rejections of claim 7 and 13 are addressed and are overcome.

The Examiner is kindly requested to reconsider and to withdraw the present rejections.

Applicants submit that the present claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request that they be found allowable.

Ciba Specialty Chemicals Corp.
540 White Plains Road
P.O. Box 2005
Tarrytown, NY 10591-9005
Tel. (914)785-2783
Fax (914)785-7102

Respectfully submitted,



Tyler A. Stevenson
Agent for Applicants
Reg. No. 46,388